

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 21, 32-53 and 55-83 are now pending in response to the above-identified Office Action.

As to these claims, Applicants note the following: claims 1-20, 22-31 and 54 have been cancelled; claims 21 is presented in its original form; claims 32-53 include appropriate amendment; claims 55-73 represent former claims 2-20, and are listed as “new” as a result of amendment which was necessary in addressing objections made as to former independent claim 1, now cancelled; and claims 74-83 represent former claims 22-31, and are listed as “new” as a result of amendment provided in regard to independent claim 21.

Specification

The Office Action had noted several objections to the specification; specifically, provided the bases for those objections in paragraph(s) enumerated “1-3”.

In view of the foregoing presentation of (1) amended portions of the specification, and (2) cancellation/amendment of pertinent claims, Applicants believe that appropriate correction to the objections listed has been provided.

Applicants take this opportunity to note that, in contrast to statement contained in the Office Action, that the plates 64 and 66 had been referred to as “liquid dispersion plates” in the “Abstract”.

Claim Objections

The Office Action had noted several objections to the claims; specifically, provided the bases for those objections in the paragraph(s) enumerated “4”.

In view of the foregoing presentation of (1) amended portions of the specification, and (2) cancellation/amendment of pertinent claims, Applicants believe that appropriate correction to the objections listed has been provided.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

In paragraph 5, the Office Action had provided a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 102(b). In subsequent paragraphs 6 and 7, it was stated that claims 1 and 21, respectively, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Jameson.

As to the rejection of claim 1, Applicants believe that appropriate correction has been provided.

As to the rejection of claim 21, Jameson provides structure which directs liquid “. . . upward and from beneath a rotating blade . . .”. Col. 2, line 46. Further direction of the liquid is then accomplished by movement of the blade. See col. 2, lines 41-51 (explaining that the liquid is intended for contact with the blade tips).

In contrast, Applicants provide, in claim 21 as now clarified, for structure which “. . . control[s] the flow of liquid therethrough so as to project such flow above the blade.” Accordingly, because Jameson does not provide for such structure, it is kindly requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

In paragraph 8, the Office Action indicates that claims 2-6, 8-20, and 22-31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In paragraph 9, the Office Action indicates that claims 32-53 are allowed.

Applicants take this opportunity to note that it is believed that appropriate amendment has been provided in response to the above pertinent direction(s); further, that such an indication of allowability is kindly appreciated.

Also, Applicants take this opportunity to note the following:

(1) although claim 7 was not mentioned in paragraph 8 of the Office Action, Applicants have treated it as a claim receiving an objection thereto since (a) it was not specifically rejected and (b) was listed as being a claim which had been objected to in the “Office Action Summary”;

(2) Applicants, in re-writing claims 2-20, have presented them as "new" claims since they required correction in regard to objections concerning naming of particular plates which had been described;

(3) Applicants, in re-writing claim 22 as "new" independent claim 74, have chosen to include the clarification provided in regard to claim 21; consequently, have applied that same status to claims which depend from claim 74; and

(4) claim 54, while not mentioned in the Office Action, has been cancelled.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is believed that this application is in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Any fees or charges due as a result of filing of the present Paper may be charged against Deposit Account 04-0525. ~~Two duplicates of this page are enclosed.~~

Respectfully,


Brian H. Buck

Express Mail

"Express Mail" mailing label number

ER 368514687 US

Date of Deposit

06 March 2004

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to:

Attention: Office of Petitions
Mail Stop Petition
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450


Typed or printed name of person mailing paper

Signature of person mailing paper

Brian H. Buck
Reg. No. 48,776
Patent Department
Deere & Company
One John Deere Place
Moline, IL 61265
Telephone No. (309) 765-4371